

## 1967 IN RETROSPECT

Coming at the end of the conference, I can only regard my remarks as an anti-climax. We have come to the point where I have heard so much and you have heard so much in the past four days that it doesn't seem as important as it did just a week ago. But I have a few general remarks, so bear with me for a few moments.

First, I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome the new regional directors to the fold. I well remember the sentiments that accompanied my moving to that inner circle of the Bureau, and nothing that has occurred since has in any way diminished my appreciation of the opportunity to work with the people who constitute the executive echelon of this agency. I think it is a high distinction in the career of anyone in the fish and wildlife business to reach this level of responsibility, and I know that both John Findlay and Ed Carlson will enjoy what lies in the years ahead for them as regional directors.

We are looking forward to this association with these familiar faces in new places. A little later in the day we will have something to say about the old faces that we are going to have to get along without.

With us today are several of the new assistant regional directors and the deputy regional directors. Their presence reflects the strengthening that we have put into our regional office organizations.

---

Presented by John S. Gottschalk, Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, at the Bureau Conference, Washington, D.C., December 4, 1967.

It must be obvious to all of you that the conference committee was making a deliberate effort, through the selection of the conference theme, to keep the Bureau's long-range thinking in tune with a changing America. It is appropriate to consider these matters now in the sense that it may be many years or more before we, as an organization, get fully tuned in to the new requirements and the new challenges that will come from the concentration of so many of our people in urban situations.

Certainly, it is not too soon for us to start thinking seriously about how our jobs and our job responsibilities are going to be modified when most of the people who actually make most of the decisions in America are living in cities. When I was just a youngster back in the early 30's working in a State park, I was struck, almost shocked, by an experience with a young boy from Chicago we apprehended for having stolen a bicycle. We were taking them into the nearest town, and as we went down the road in this truck, a couple of crows flew across the road. These city kids forgot their predicament at this first sight of a wild bird. One of them said, "It must be a pheasant--it is a pheasant!" This small story has stayed with me all these years because it gave me an early insight into the level of knowledge of the slum child about nature.

In the last few years that there has been a tremendous acceleration of the rate at which our population has been concentrating in the urban

environment. Where there were once 10 there are now 20, and twice the ignorance of man's ultimate dependence on the natural environment.

There is no question that we are going to have to concentrate a great deal more in the next couple of years on the problem of urban expansion to try to identify our responsibilities and to try to shape policies and programs that will meet these responsibilities. We are dealing not necessarily with a new type, but rather with a type of American who is quite different from those we customarily think we are working with and for. I'd like to say more about this general subject toward the end of my remarks today, but for the time being let us just put this thought on the shelf.

Meanwhile, let me take a few minutes to review 1967. It's no news to anybody, of course, that it has been a difficult year. Perhaps I am becoming inured to the pressures of our budget problems in the Federal establishment or perhaps we, as an organization, are better able to cope. In any event, it seems to me that while it has been a difficult year, it hasn't been an impossible one. There have been a couple of years in the not-too-distant past when it seemed that we were being called on to do the impossible. Of course, there isn't anyone here today who can't see many things that they would like to do, or what is more significant, many things that need to be done and which can only be accomplished if we can focus more manpower and,

in some cases, more money on the particular job. As I travel around visiting hatcheries and refuges and field offices I can see that we're making adjustments needed to live with the prevailing kind of situation. The fact is clear, it seems to me, that a lot is being done. There has been a lot of planning done, and we are building substantially to provide for capabilities which haven't existed before.

But we are leaving somethings undone. If we're leaving undone the maintenance, if we're not protecting our capital investment, we are only compounding difficulties for the future. But it doesn't look as impossible as it did a few months ago. Without giving away any secrets, I would say that our total budget situation, looking ahead to fiscal year 1969, isn't as bad as it might have been. Our land acquisition program is going at the same rate, and most of our other programs are proceeding except those that involve construction. We're not expanding and to the extent that when you're not moving forward you're slipping backward, we are in a retrogressive position. But it doesn't seem as severe as it might have been.

All humans have a tendency to castigate themselves when they become introspective and look at themselves critically and see all of the things that they should have done which they didn't do. Perhaps there is more substantial progress being made than we sometimes think.

Let's think about some of the things that we did do. The Endangered Species Program has gotten the Bureau and the Department a great deal of new exposure before the American people. It is significant that it has

provided a means by which we can put into our activities a substantial foundation of information on how to cope with problems of conserving endangered species. We did not possess this just a couple of years ago. Both in the animal propagation program at Patuxent and in the field studies, we have made real progress.

For example, Don Fortenberry has increased the range and the population of blackfooted ferrets, so that from a situation where we weren't even sure the sly little creatures existed, we now may have to go to the Secretary to have him un-declare it as an endangered species. To a lesser degree, the same thing happened with the Everglade Kite. The highest count of kites we had in the last few years was about nine birds. Recently, I got a report from our men in Florida that they had located about 30 birds. This is progress. We have more whooping cranes extant in the world today than we have had since people began to be concerned about whooping cranes. The studies that Fred Sibley has been able to make in California have not done very much about upping the California Condor count. We are, however, getting a lot more know-how about that problem bird. We can run on down through the whole program and come to one conclusion: there has been some real progress.

As you have heard someone say earlier, this Bureau is, and is going to be, very deeply involved in the wilderness program. The Secretary has said that we may be the largest managers of wilderness

of any agency in the United States. The refuge staff has knocked itself out both in Washington and in the field carrying out the 28 studies, pulling material together, and working up the reports. We are the only Bureau to come close to meeting our wilderness study commitments.

Probably no part of our program has been the subject of so much speculative "soul-searching" and philosophical "wool-gathering" as the general program that we call "recreation-interpretation." We haven't really come to a final position on it. We won't for some time. We have a much wider vista of this field of interpretation, education, and recreation than we had formerly, but I think we are going to have to do a great deal more thinking about the general question of what the Bureau ought to be doing. Mr. Buell's speech at the conference of Refuge Managers at Everglades Park is the best statement on this subject that we have, and if you have problems I suggest that you read it. It sets forth the broad philosophy and the foundation that we should be working from in developing our recreational concepts.

Tomorrow afternoon I'll be talking to the Regional Directors about what we are going to do in the next few months in the way of getting this program under way. It will involve the identification of a special team that is going to work on a particular refuge to develop an interpretive program as a trial run. From this, we'll move on to an expansion of this program on a much wider basis. This doesn't mean that every refuge is going to be interpreted, or handled in this way at

all, for that matter, or that it is going to have a lot or even a little recreational development. Every refuge has to be put into a different context from the rest. Every thought about what we ought to do on that particular refuge is going to have to be a little bit different from that about another. In some refuges we are going to have camp grounds. We have them. We're going to have bigger ones. In some cases where we might have a road, we might vacate that road and obliterate it because the road itself will be a damaging factor in trying to achieve the best possible goal for that particular installation.

This past year we have seen the establishment and the staffing and the beginning of developing a program for fish cultural development centers. We have growing pains already. There is a question of duplication between the development centers and parts of our fishery research program. There are all kinds of duplication. Some of it is unwarranted but some of it is desirable. Let it be said that the fish culture development centers, carried out in a rational manner, will be an essential link between the laboratory and the man working in the production hatchery. There doesn't need to be useless duplication, and we are going to identify it and eliminate it where we see it. But the fish cultural development center can provide us real aid in working toward that essential refinement of capability in the use of fish stocking as a management tool in tomorrow's America.

Even though we didn't make much progress with it (and perhaps we have more problems today than before we did it), we have moved the enhancement program out of the River Basin Studies and given it to Wildlife Services.

As I say, this might be creating problems but, nevertheless, we've got it organizationally where it belongs, and given time, a little more money, a little more manpower, we're going to make that enhancement program the vital part of Wildlife Services which it should be. Here again, I think that the impact on the urban population of tomorrow will come to be a central part of the work of the Division of Wildlife Services. They are an organization which can work in this field and ultimately soon, I hope, we will get them going in that direction.

Our marine research program has not made a great leap forward this year independently, but in the sense of Bureau involvement in the larger effort, that of the Department, we have made some substantial progress. I sat yesterday morning in the opening session of the Departmental Marine Resources Program Advisory Committee which we have been very much a part of. Moreover, we have been feeding a tremendous amount of information into the development of policies and organization for the Nation's total marine effort in the years to come.

We are well on the way to getting Fish and Fishing into a first draft condition. The authors have been lined up, and we are going ahead full steam. We've made a real big start on it this year.

Our Cooperative Wildlife Research Units have been sort of a little "tail on the dog" for a long time, crippling along on an inadequate budget, the same basic budget that they had when they were started. This year,



after several years of patient effort and with help from several sources, we were able to secure financing which is putting these Cooperative Wildlife Research Units on a level comparable with the Fisheries Units and on a level which will enable them to expand their effectiveness. This demonstrates the fact that in bureaucracy one of the greatest assets is patience. We may get knocked down two or three or more times, but ultimately, if we've got a good, legitimate product we can sell it.

We have our Bureau paper, In-Sight, started. We're not entirely satisfied with it; we are going to improve it. And we're going to make it more effective next year.

We did something that I think is unique in the annals of Federal fish and wildlife management. We proposed, developed, put into effect, and stayed with a system of rationing the taking of game--one piece of game per person. I think the consensus would have been that it couldn't be done, but this year we did it. The people in Region 3, with Al Studholme here, were successful in organizing and carrying out a goose-tag project at Horicon, which gives us an important precedent for a lot of similar problems which stem from a harvest smaller than the number of people interested in participating in it. I think it was a substantial organizational feat and a noteworthy achievement.

We have accomplished a reorganization of our regional office set-up, as you all well know, which puts back an additional high level executive

position and allows us to set up a Deputy Regional Director. This will be significant over the long pull, because it will free the Regional Director himself for handling not only broad policy and planning, but in encouraging public interest and backing for the things we are trying to do.

We have established this year the position of Career Development Officer. That program is going. We've been waiting to get the man on the job, and we're now ready to move toward something that many of us have been talking about for a long time; that is, formally working toward the maximum integration of job requirements and individual aspirations.

There have been many personnel changes in the divisions here in Washington as well as in the field. We've got several new Division Chiefs; we have a new Assistant Director. These things do have an impact and mean that as an organization we are not just standing still. In that respect, the designation of a Waterfowl Management Coordinator, Al Studholme, is another sign that we are moving and that we are being aggressive in a positive and constructive way as we organize to meet our responsibilities.

In the general area of organization I should mention a review of grades that has been taking place over the past several months, stimulated by criticism and comments from the Civil Service Commission after they audited some of our offices. Our review of grades and incumbents'

capabilities will have a far-reaching effect upon both the regional offices and the Washington office. We now have two Regional Supervisors of the Division of Wildlife Refuges who have been promoted to Grade 14. You can expect there will be more of this as time goes on. It will not be carried out, however, on a blanket basis. We are not going to automatically upgrade all supervisors to Grade 14 and start a great mushrooming of general upgrading. There will, however, be carefully selected positions which are going to be reviewed and which will undoubtedly be upgraded.

Moving on to another area, the general area of human rights, I am not so concerned about human rights from the standpoint of Bureau image as I am from the standpoint of what we are concretely and positively doing to upgrade the people of our country who, for one reason or another, have had a bad shake in life.

I would like to pay my respects to the Job Corps organization for what it has done. Many of the Job Corps Centers that have been organized have been beset by controversy and strife. The administration of the seven Job Corps Conservation Centers in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has been essentially free of this sort of thing. Yet we have not taken a dictatorial or authoritarian approach toward the discipline problem. The record, I think, speaks very highly of the men we have out on the job. They are a group of sensitive people who can talk to these young boys and get to them in a way that the stimulus for unrest

is eliminated. We owe that group of men a great deal, as well as the men in the Bureau from our central and regional organizations.

Perhaps you know about the Delaware State Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Unit, which is being organized at Delaware State College. Delaware State was originally a Negro school. Its racial mix is now more nearly 50-50 because a lot of white folks decided to take advantage of the low tuition rates. We have an item in the budget to establish a full-fledged unit there in 1969. If this is acted on favorably and we think it will be, we will be taking that first step toward providing academic training for Negroes who are interested in careers in fish and wildlife management.

We have recruited five game management agents who come from minority groups. Four are Negroes and one is of Japanese ancestry. They are trainees at the moment, but some of these men will certainly reach positions of full-fledged appointments as game management agents when they are fully qualified.

So, in spite of the disappointments, I think overall the year has not been too bad. When you stop and analyze all that has happened, much has happened for the good.

I do not wish to dwell on disappointments, but feel I must say that one of our big disappointments has been the emasculation of H.R. 25, the so-called Estuary Bill, the bill to protect estuaries. It's still being considered by the Congress in a greatly watered-down version.

One of the frustrations, if not disappointments, that we have suffered is the controversy that we have been having with the States on the general question of who has the authority and responsibility to manage resident wildlife on areas of the National Wildlife Refuge System. I don't know where this is going to come out. I have a meeting with the Executive Committee of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners on Monday to continue the dialogue. Whether we will be able to achieve an acceptance of the status quo, or whether there will be insistence on the States for legislation to clarify the point, I don't know.

Our policy provides that the Secretary will continue to decide when and if an area of the refuge system should be opened to hunting or fishing. Once he has made that decision, if he decides to open an area, the area will be opened in accordance with the regulations of the State. State licenses, of course, would be required for anyone hunting or fishing on any of the Federal refuges. In situations where animals were damaging or were about to damage the habitat, the Secretary could undertake a control program after consultation with the State. This is the policy that's in our manual, and I think it protects the State's interests. There is a clause in the Taylor Grazing Act that specifically alludes to the protection of the State's police power so there is nothing that the Secretary can do to prevent the State from managing fish and wildlife by the exercise of its police powers in grazing districts of the public domain.

National parks represent a special case. In some of these there has been a cession of title and sovereignty to the Federal Government; in others, there is special legislation. Finally, and this is the last part as far as the problem areas go, on the national seashores and the national recreation areas a general policy was agreed to and approved by the International Association two years ago, even to the extent of the form of a Memorandum of Understanding that would be entered into between the National Park Service and the States. The trouble is that having established this policy no State has yet signed a Memorandum of Understanding based on the policy.

The real issue, of course, is who actually has the authority to manage resident wildlife on areas in Federal ownership, rather than the character of any operating situation. A finding that the Federal Government has the authority could simply relieve the State fish and game departments of their responsibilities in the States of the West, where large amounts of land are owned by the Federal Government. The States believe they have the authority, and if they do not have and the Federal agencies will not give them the authority, they will ask the Congress to change the laws.

Now, to come back to the item that I told you to put on the shelf at the beginning of my remarks, that is, the challenge to our Bureau to think about "Urbania," and what its problems are going to be from the wildlife conservation standpoint. I think our discussions at this meeting have

cracked the door enough to permit us to glimpse a small sample of our future challenge. We have not even begun to get into an "in depth" consideration of the kind of problems we are going to be dealing with. Thus, it seems to me that we will have to concentrate on this problem; this I propose to do this coming year. As an outgrowth of the sessions that we have had here at this conference, I propose to ask the Secretary to call what might be a first, a national conference on wildlife conservation in urban America. At this conference I would want not only Bureau people but also people who are deeply involved in the urban crisis. I'd like to get people who are professional workers in the field of sociology as related to recreation in "Urbania" into such a conference. I'd like to get representation from the academic field--not the fish and wildlife academic field--but the sociological academic field who have ideas of how to achieve a factual basis for our ideas of what we can and should be doing in this area. I'd like to see State people represented at such a conference.

So, as a result of the discussions that we've had so far this week, I can say my conclusion is that we need to have another conference. We really need to look at this responsibility much more closely than we have so far in the conference this week. Out of this I see other possibilities. I see the possibility that in the Bureau, itself, we may have to organize to meet these responsibilities in a different way than we have. I don't

know exactly how this would be at the moment. This is something that should come from the subsequent conference and the backwash of that subsequent conference. We may some day see a Division of Urban Affairs in the Bureau. Nevertheless, rather than just to let this conversation of the past three days drift away into an echoless past, I propose to use it as a start toward expanding on our comprehension of what the role of wildlife in tomorrow's America can be.

This is a challenge to the Bureau and, as the Bureau is a sum of all of you and some 3,000-odd besides you, it is a challenge to many individuals. We can meet the challenge if we are determined, and if we continue as we have been to be dedicated to the idea that there is a place for wildlife and people in tomorrow's America.